

REMARKS

Claims 11, 16, 19, 23, 24, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34 -38 are pending. In the prior amendment entered on 21 September 2009 with the filing of an RCE, applicants submitted **new claims 34 – 38 which were not examined or addressed by the Examiner in the office action mailed 24 November 2009**. Should these claims not be allowed, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a new **non-final** office action in order to continue the prosecution as intended by the applicants. However, the claims are further amended herein in view of the Examiner's remarks presented in the outstanding Office Communication regarding Section 101. Also, the following argument is responsive to the points made in the Office Communication concerning the rejections under Section 103. Also, applicants suggest there is some further confusion with regard to the claims now pending because the Examiner has made an objection (based on claim dependency) to claims 13-15, 17-18, 25-26 and 28, but these claims are not pending. For these reasons, any further Office Communication which is not a Notice of Allowance should be made non-final in order to provide the Applicants with a full opportunity to respond to any reasoned rejections or objections that the Examiner may have.

The following remarks address the examiner's *Response to Arguments* at pages 2-4 of the office action.

With respect to the continued rejections under Section 101, applicant's first request reconsideration of the argument presented at pages 6-7 of the amendment filed 21 September 2009. Further, per the Examiner's suggestions, all of the independent claims are amended to recite a computer. Support for this is found at paragraph 24 of the published application. Also, it is noted that claims 34 and 38 have recited a processing unit which is intended to be equivalent to the hardware processor or controller suggested by the Examiner. For these reasons the rejections under Section 101 can more certainly be withdrawn.

None of the prior art (e.g., neither the Swales reference nor the Linder reference) disclose the features recited in claims 11 and 29. For example, claim 11(amended) requires that:

Internet protocols are provided and used for communication between the software modules of the web server and for communication between the software modules and components outside of the web server

The argument in the office action makes note that the prior art discloses or inherently includes some various communications between modules (or between a program and a user), but none of the cited disclosure relates to use of Internet protocols between modules in the same web server. The claims 11 and 29 have been amended to more expressly recite this feature. Citation to Linder Figure 1 does not address this deficiency.

For the reasons noted applicants continue to disagree with the basis for the art rejections. It is also urged that the argument in par 13 at page 5 of the office action should be amended because Swales does not provide or use Internet protocols for communication between the software modules in a web server.

If the Examiner still disagrees with the above argument, the Examiner is requested to carry the burden of expressly stating a prima facie case of obviousness. The Examiner must withdraw the rejection based on an inability of the prior art to provide full and complete support for a prima facie case of obviousness.

(Please continue to the next page.)

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons all of the rejections should be removed and the application should be passed to allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb 23, 2010

By: Janet D. Hood
Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830